Draft version March 29, 2017
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style AASTeX6 v. 1.0

arXiv:1703.09232v1 [astro-ph.HE] 27 Mar 2017

IS THE REPEATING FRB 121102 REPRESENTATIVE OF FRBS?

Divya Palaniswamy and Bing Zhang
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV 89154
divyapal@physics.unlv.edu, zhang@physics.unlv.edu

ABSTRACT

The repeating FRB 121102 (the "repeater") shows active bursting activities and was localized in a host galaxy at $z = 0.193$. On the other hand, despite hundreds of hours of telescope time spent on follow-up observations, no other FRBs have been observed to repeat. Yet, it has been speculated that the repeater is the proto-type of FRBs, and that other FRBs should show similar repeating patterns. Using the published data, we compare the repeater with other FRBs in the *observed* time interval (Δt) - flux ratio (S_i/S_{i+1}) plane. We find that whereas the bursts from the repeater occupy the lower left region of the plot (short interval and small flux ratio), other FRBs occupy the upper right region via non-detection lower limits in time and flux ratio. The trend also exists even if one selects only those bursts detectable by the Parkes radio telescope. If other FRBs were similar to the repeater, they should have been observed to repeat with the current searches. We suggest that either the repeater may have a different progenitor system from other FRBs, or if it shares the same progenitor system with others, must be unusually active compared with others. In any case, the repeating FRB 121102 is likely not representative of FRBs.

Keywords: Fast Radio Bursts, FRB Source classifications, Radio Transients, FRB progenitors

1. INTRODUCTION

A decade ago a mysterious new class of millisecond-duration radio transients called Fast Radio Bursts (FRBs) were discovered (Lorimer et al. 2007). FRBs are highly dispersed, bright ($\sim$ Jy), and (some of them) highly polarized bursts (Lorimer et al. 2007; Keane et al. 2012; Thornton et al. 2013; Spitler et al. 2014; Petroff et al. 2015; Masui et al. 2015; Keane et al. 2016; Champion et al. 2016; Ravi et al. 2016). Since the first discovery, twenty-six FRBs have been discovered and eighteen have been published[1]. The significant excess in dispersion measure (DM) implies that the sources are at cosmological distances, e.g. in the redshift range $0.2 - 1.5$. The isotropic energy release of FRBs is estimated to be in the range of $\sim 10^{40-41}$ erg.

Out of these detected FRBs, one source, FRB 121102 (also known as the "repeater"), clearly repeats (Spitler et al. 2016; Scholz et al. 2016). Thanks to its repeating behavior, a radio nebula associated with the source was detected (Chatterjee et al. 2017; Marcote et al. 2017) and a star formation host galaxy at $z = 0.193$ was identified (Tendulkar et al. 2017), which provides solid evidence of the cosmological origin of FRBs. Most of other FRBs have been closely monitored since their discoveries, but so far no positive detection of a repeating burst has been reported (e.g. Petroff et al. 2015; Champion et al. 2016). One possible exception might be the FRB 110220 / FRB 140514 pair, which are in the same 14.4 arcmin beam and are 9 arcmin apart. Piro & Burke-Spolaor (2017) hypothesized that they may originate from the same neutron star embedded within a supernova remnant (SNR) that provides an evolving DM as the ejecta expands. A detection of a third burst with an even smaller DM from this location would support this hypothesis. In any case, it is believed by many that other FRBs are not much different from the repeater, and the non-detection of the repeating bursts from those sources might be due to the lower sensitivity of the Parkes telescope (which detected most of the FRBs) than the Arecibo 300-m telescope (which detected many bursts of the repeater) (e.g. Spitler et al. 2016; Lu & Kumar 2016). On the other hand, it has been also suggested that there might be more than one class of FRBs: e.g. repeating and non-repeating ones (Keane et al. 2016).

Many FRB progenitor models have been proposed in the literature. Some models invoke non-catastrophic events such as giant magnetar flares (Popov & Postnov 2010; Kulkarni et al. 2014; Katz 2016), giant pulses from young pulsars (Cordes & Wasserman 2016; Connor

[1] http://www.astronomy.swin.edu.au/pulsar/frbcat/

et al. 2016) and young rapidly-spinning magnetars (Metzger et al. 2017; Kashiyama & Murase 2017), repeated material captures of asteroids by neutron stars (Dai et al. 2016), and "cosmic combing" events when astrophysical streams interact with the magnetosphere of an old neutron star (Zhang 2017). These models may be relevant to repeating FRBs. Alternatively, other classes of models invoke catastrophic events, such as the collapse of supra-massive neutron stars (the so-called "blitzars") (Falcke & Rezzolla 2014; Zhang 2014) and mergers of compact stars (NS-NS, NS-BH, BH-BH) (Totani 2013; Zhang 2016; Wang et al. 2016). The FRBs produced from these systems would not repeat.

In this paper, we use the published detection data of the repeating FRB 121102 and the non-detection data of other FRBs to investigate whether FRB 121102 is representative of FRBs in terms of its repeating behavior.

2. FRB REPEATING TIME INTERVAL - FLUX RATIO DISTRIBUTION

If other FRBs also repeat but no repeating bursts are detected, there could be due to two reasons: (1) The repeating time interval (duty cycle) is long, and the current observation time is not long enough to catch another one yet; (2) The other repeating bursts have occurred, but are too faint to be detected by the searching telescopes (e.g. Parkes). In order to quantify these two effects, we introduce two parameters: the time interval between bursts, Δt, and the peak flux ratio between two adjacent bursts, S_i/S_{i+1}.

2.1. *The Raw* $\Delta t - (S_i/S_{i+1})$ *Plot*

One trouble in defining a time interval between repeating bursts is that the observations are usually not continuous (this is the case for both repeating bursts and other nn-repeating FRBs). Due to telescope constraints, it is essentially impossible to continuously observe one source long enough to test the repetitive behavior of the FRB source. In our analysis, we define the *observed* time interval between bursts as the time interval which dismisses all the time periods during which no observations were performed. If FRB bursts happen randomly in time, such an effective duration would give a good reflection of the repetitive behavior of the source. The bursting behavior of FRB 121102 is not completely random, which shows an episodic behavior, e.g. when repeating bursts occur, they occur in groups. However, if there are enough observational epochs each with long enough durations, such episodic behavior would be smoothed out. Lacking better ways to quantify the time intervals between bursts, we adopt the observed time interval, Δt, to delineate the duty cycle of FRBs.

For the repeating FRB 121102, the first burst was discovered in the PALFA survey at 1.4 GHz. Later an extensive follow-up observation using Arecibo resulted in the detection of 10 more bursts. Another six bursts from this source were later detected and published: five from Green Bank telescope at 2.0 GHz and one at 1.4 GHz with the Arecibo Observatory. In our analysis, we include altogether a total of 17 bursts based on the published signature, even though by now > 140 bursts from this source have been detected, but are not published yet (L. Spitler, 2017, talk presented at the Aspen FRB conference). Including 140 bursts in our analysis will only strengthen the conclusion of this paper.

Bursts from this source are very irregular and clustered in time (non-Poissionian distribution) (Scholz et al. 2016). The total telescope time spent on FRB121102 was over 70 hours for the observations of the 17 bursts. Of the 17 bursts, six bursts were found within a 10 min of observing period and additional four were detected in a 20-min observing window (Scholz et al. 2016). The total observing time is spread over telescopes with different sensitivities and the observations were done on different radio frequencies. For completeness, we include all the bursts regardless of telescope and frequency. The time intervals Δt are calculated for each pair of adjacent bursts defined by the sequence numbers i and $i+1$. Table 2 presents Δt of all adjacent pairs of the bursts, which are also presented in Figure 1.

Other FRBs (detected by Parkes and GBT) have been extensively followed up on a variety range of timescales, some with dozens or even hundreds of hours of observational times. No additional bursts have been detected. We include all the observational times *after* the detection of the original burst and define it as the lower limit of Δt. The data are shown in Table 2 and presented in Figure 1.



Figure 1. The raw Δt - S_i/S_{i+1} distribution plot of the repeater and other FRBs. For other FRBs, based on non-detections, only lower limits of Δt and S_i/S_{i+1} are presented, which are indicated as arrows. FRB110220 and FRB140514 are both presented separately (assuming that they are related) and jointly (assuming they are from the same source, purple square).

The flux ratio is defined as S_i/S_{i+1}, where S_i and S_{i+1} are the peak flux of $i-$th and $(i+1)$-th burst. It is greater/less than one if the next FRB is fainter/brighter. For non-detections, one may set a lower limit of ratio based on the sensitivity of the telescopes.

The peak fluxes and pulse widths for each burst from FRB 121102 are very different. For completeness, we include all the bursts to define S_i/S_{i+1}, most of which were detected at 1.4 GHz, but some of which were detected at 2 GHz. They are presented in Figure 1.

For other FRBs, since no repeating bursts have been detected, any possible burst during the observation time frame, if any, must have a peak flux that is faint enough to evade detection. For these FRBs, instead of plotting S_i/S_{i+1}, we plot $S_i/S_{bg,7}$, where $S_{bg,7}$ is defined as 7σ above the background flux. This is because if a signal is 7σ above the background, it would be regarded as a "detection".

The raw $\Delta t - S_i/S_{i+1}$ plot is shown in Figure 1. One can immediately see that the bursts from the repeating FRB 121102 are located at a very different region (lower left region of the plot) from other FRBs in the $\Delta t - S_i/S_{i+1}$ plane. The time intervals between bursts are much shorter, and the flux ratios are smaller, some of them are even less than unity (suggesting that the later burst is brighter than the earlier one). Other FRBs, on the other hand, are located in the upper right region of the plot. Since we used the non-detection limits to place those FRBs in the plot, the true region of those FRBs are even pushed further towards right. We tentatively draw the conclusion that FRB 121102 is special and not representative of other FRBs.

Assuming that FRB 110220 and FRB 140514 belong to the same source, as argued by Piro & Burke-Spolaor (2017), we plot another point (purple square) based on the detected values. This point sits between the region of FRB 121102 and the region of other FRBs. On the other hand, the non-detection of other bursts following FRB 140514 again places the second point of the source to the region of other FRBs. If the hypothesis is confirmed by future observations, FRB 110220/140514 would be an intermediate source between the most frequent repeater FRB 121102 and other FRBs.

Table 1. The observation information of 17 bursts detected from the repeater FRB 121102. Column 1 gives the bursts number, column 2 gives the receive and telescope names, column 3 gives the peak flux density for each bursts, column 4 gives the observed time interval Δt between the burst i and $i+1$, column 5 gives the flux ratio S_i/S_{i+1}, and column 6 gives the references.

Burst Number	Telescope/ Receiver	Peak Flux Jy	Δt (hours)	Flux Ratio S_i/S_{i+1}	Ref
1	AO/ALFA	0.04	3.25	1.33	[1,2]
2	AO/ALFA	0.03	0.142	1.00	[2,3]
3	AO/ALFA	0.03	0.401	0.75	[2,3]
4	AO/ALFA	0.04	0.16	2.00	[2,3]
5	AO/ALFA	0.02	0.116	2.00	[2,3]
6	AO/ALFA	0.02	0.006	0.142	[2,3]
7	AO/ALFA	0.14	0.016	2.80	[2,3]
8	AO/ALFA	0.05	0.052	1.00	[2,3]
9	AO/ALFA	0.05	0.047	1.00	[2,3]
10	AO/ALFA	0.05	0.016	0.16	[2,3]
11	AO/ALFA	0.31	7.66	10.33	[2,3]
12	AO/L-WIDE	0.03	N/A	N/A	[2,3]

NOTE—[1] Spitler et al. (2014); [2] Spitler et al. (2016); [3] Scholz et al. (2016)

Table 2. The follow-up observation information of other FRBs that do not show repeating bursts, including the total number of observation hours and $S_i/S_{bg,7}$.

FRB Name (yymmdd)	Total hours (hours)	Flux Ratio $S_i/S_{bg,7}$	Reference
FRB110220	1.75	7.0	[1,2]
FRB110626	11.25	1.57	[1,2]
FRB110703	10.1	2.28	[1,2]
FRB120127	5.5	1.57	[1,2]
FRB090625	33.65	4.28	[1,3]
FRB121002	10.25	2.28	[1,3]
FRB130626	9.5	3.00	[1,3]
FRB130628	9.0	4.14	[1,3]
FRB130729	10	1.99	[1,3]
FRB140514	19.2	2.28	[4]
$FRB010125^{\dagger}$	-	4.28	[5]
FRB010621	15.5	2.57	[6,11]
FRB010724	40	3.28	[7]

Table 2 continued

Table 2 *(continued)*

FRB Name (yymmdd)	Total hours (hours)	Flux Ratio $S_i/S_{bg,7}$	Reference
FRB131104	78	4.28	[8]
FRB150418	13.0	5.57	[9]
FRB150807	215	1.42	[10]

† - Follow up hours are not published

NOTE—[1]Petroff et al. (2015); [2]Thornton et al. (2013) [3] Champion et al. (2016) [4] Petroff et al. (2015) [5] Burke-Spolaor & Bannister (2014) [6] Keane et al. (2012) [7]Lorimer et al. (2007) [8] Ravi et al. (2015) [9] Keane et al. (2016) [10]Ravi et al. (2016) [11] Bannister & Madsen (2014)

2.2. *Correcting to the sensitivity limit of Parkes*

Since Arecibo is more sensitive than Parkes, a more rigorous treatment of the repeating FRB 121102 should include only those bursts that are above the Parkes sensitivity threshold and are detected in the 1.4 GHz band for a fair comparison with the results of other FRBs.

The peak flux density (for pulse widths ranging from $1.28 - 8.192$ ms using signal to noise ratio of 7.0) of Parkes are in the range $0.2 - 0.079$ Jy. Out of 12 repeating bursts from FRB 121102 at 1.4 GHz, two bursts (bursts number 7 and bursts number 11) are above the Parkes S/N cutoff limit. Both bursts 7 and 11 were originally detected by Arecibo within a 10 min observation window (Spitler et al. 2016). Parkes radio telescope would easily detect these two bursts. We therefore skip bursts 8, 9, and 10 (pretend that they were not detected) and redefine Δt and S_i/S_{i+1} and plot it in Figure 2. Out of the 5 bursts detected by GBT at 2 GHz, one of them (number 16) would be detectable by Parkes for a flat spectrum. The spectral indices of the repeating bursts of FRB 121102 vary significantly from burst to burst (Spitler et al. 2016), so it is hard to reliably extrapolate the 2 GHz flux to 1.4 GHz. For indicative purpose, we assume a flat spectrum (spectral index 0) and include burst number 16 to plot a second point in Figure 2. Finally, with "non-detection" after burst number 16, we draw another lower-limit point for the repeater similar to other FRBs.

Figure 2 suggests that even if two of the three points (the 11-16 pair and post-16) are in the mix of other FRBs, one point (the 7-11 pair) lies in the far lower-left corner of the plot. Since the total observation hours of other FRBs have greatly exceeded 70 hours (two of them, FRB131104 and FRB150807, each have follow-up hours more than 70 hours), some repeating bursts should have been detected if all other FRBs are similar to the repeater. The non-detection of any repeating bursts from any of those FRBs therefore suggests that FRB 121102 very likely is not representative of other FRBs.



Figure 2. The $\Delta t - S_i/S_{i+1}$ plot after only selecting bursts detectable with the Parkes telescope and at 1.4 GHz. The repeater has three points: left (6-11 pair), middle (11-16 pair), right (after burst 16).

3. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Using the published data, we compare the repeating FRB 121102 and other FRBs in the $\Delta t - (S_i/S_{i+1})$ plane. We found that the repeater is well separated from other FRBs in the plane. It has a much smaller duty cycle and a smaller flux ratio than other bursts. The conclusion remains valid if one chooses only bursts that are detectable with the Parkes radio telescope. Hundreds of hours of telescope time have been spent on the follow-up observations of several other FRBs, yet none of them have been observed to repeat. The repeating FRB 121102 is likely not representative of all FRBs.

Since only the published data are used to perform this study, our conclusion is very conservative. Many more bursts have been detected from the repeating FRB 121102 (L. Spitler, 2017, talk at Aspen FRB conference), and many more hours have been spent on other FRBs without a detection of repeating FRBs. This suggests that FRB 121102 and other FRBs should be even more separated in the $\Delta t - (S_i/S_{i+1})$ plane, which further strengthens our conclusion.

Physically there could be two possibilities. First, maybe all FRBs share a same progenitor system, but FRB 121102 is unusually active in terms of producing repeating bursts. Within the spindown and magnetic powered models (e.g. Metzger et al. 2017; Kashiyama & Murase 2017; Cao et al. 2017), an active central engine should correspond to a relatively young age. According to this picture, other FRBs should have older ages than the repeater. However, the essentially zero evolution of DM for the repeater (Spitler et al. 2016; Scholz et al. 2016) places a lower limit on the age of

the putative supernova remnant associated with the pulsar (e.g. Metzger et al. 2017). This is in apparent conflict with the suggested FRB 110220/140514 association (Piro & Burke-Spolaor 2017), which has a much more rapid DM evolution but less frequent bursts. Possible solutions may invoke a mechanism not directly related to the spindown or the magnetic power of the central engine. In the cosmic comb model that invokes the kinetic energy of a nearby explosion or flare to power FRBs (Zhang 2017), the repeater is interpreted as a marginal combing system with the plasma-stream pressure not extremely higher than the magnetic pressure of the foreground neutron star, so that the magnetosphere can be repeatedly combed to produce repeating bursts. Other FRBs may correspond to more common cases that the stream ram pressure greatly exceeds magnetic pressure, so that repetition is not common. Alternatively, in the gravitational-energy-powered scenarios (e.g. Dai et al. 2016), the abnormally-high rate of repetition in the repeater may be related to special geometric configurations that allow more frequent triggers of the bursts.

The second possibility is that the repeating FRB 121102 has a distinct progenitor system than (at least some of) other FRBs. One possibility is that (at least some of) other FRBs are produced in catastrophic events so that they are intrinsically non-repeating FRBs. Blitzars (Falcke & Rezzolla 2014; Zhang 2014) and merger of compact stars (Totani 2013; Kashiyama et al. 2013; Zhang 2016; Wang et al. 2016) remain attractive candidate progenitors for these non-repeating FRBs.

This work is partially supported by NASA through grants NNX15AK85G and NNX14AF85G to UNLV.

REFERENCES

Bannister, K. W., & Madsen, G. J. 2014, MNRAS, 440, 353
Burke-Spolaor, S., & Bannister, K. W. 2014, ApJ, 792, 19
Cao, X.-F., Yu, Y.-W., & Dai, Z.-G. 2017, arXiv:1701.05482
Champion, D. J., Petroff, E., Kramer, M., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 460, L30
Chatterjee, S., Law, C. J., Wharton, R. S., et al. 2017, Nature, 541, 58
Connor, L., Sievers, J., & Pen, U.-L. 2016, MNRAS, 458, L19
Cordes, J. M., & Wasserman, I. 2016, MNRAS, 457, 232
Dai, Z. G., Wang, J. S., Wu, X. F. & Huang, Y. F. 2016, ApJ, 829, 27
Falcke, H., & Rezzolla, L. 2014, A&A, 562, A137
Kashiyama, K., Ioka, K., & Mészáros, P. 2013, ApJL, 776, L39
Kashiyama, K. & Murase, K. 2017, ApJL, in press (arXiv:1701.04815)
Katz, J. I. 2016, ApJ, 826, 226
Keane, E. F., Johnston, S., Bhandari, S., et al. 2016, Nature, 530, 453
Keane, E. F., Stappers, B. W., Kramer, M., & Lyne, A. G. 2012, MNRAS, 425, L71
Kulkarni, S. R., Ofek, E. O., Neill, J. D., Zheng, Z., & Juric, M. 2014, ApJ, 797, 70
Lorimer, D. R., Bailes, M., McLaughlin, M. A., Narkevic, D. J., & Crawford, F. 2007, Science, 318, 777
Lu, W., & Kumar, P. 2016, MNRAS, 461, L122
Masui, K., Lin, H.-H., Sievers, J., et al. 2015, Nature, 528, 523
Marcote, B., Paragi, Z., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2017, ApJL, 834, L8
Metzger, B. D., Berger, E. & Margalit, B. 2017, ApJ, submitted (arXiv:1701.02370)
Petroff, E., Bailes, M., Barr, E. D., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 447, 246
Petroff, E., Johnston, S., Keane, E. F., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 454, 457
Piro, A. L., & Burke-Spolaor, S. 2017, arXiv:1703.03013
Popov, S. B., & Postnov, K. A. 2010, Evolution of Cosmic Objects through their Physical Activity, 129
Ravi, V., Shannon, R. M., Bailes, M., et al. 2016, Science, 354, 1249
Ravi, V., Shannon, R. M., & Jameson, A. 2015, ApJL, 799, L5
Scholz, P., Spitler, L. G., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2016, ApJ, 833, 177
Spitler, L. G., Scholz, P., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2016, Nature, 531, 202
Spitler, L. G., Cordes, J. M., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2014, ApJ, 790, 101
Tendulkar, S. P., Bassa, C. G., Cordes, J. M., et al. 2017, ApJL, 834, L7
Thornton, D., Stappers, B., Bailes, M., et al. 2013, Science, 341, 53
Totani, T. 2013, PASJ, 65,
Wang, J.-S., Yang, Y.-P., Wu, X.-F., Dai, Z.-G., & Wang, F.-Y. 2016, ApJL, 822, L7
Zhang, B. 2014, ApJL, 780, L21
Zhang, B. 2016, ApJL, 827, L31
Zhang, B. 2017, ApJL, 836, L32